



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

8. We point to him still, as one who, in his human nature, feels for our infirmities; as interceding for us now in Heaven before God, and, therefore, able "to save for ever them that come to God by him."—Hebrews vii. 25. We think him the great end and object of all love; and the great object of all our labours is, that nothing else shall stand between, to prevent the groaning sinner looking straight to this great high priest.

Is it of this that Mr. M'Manus means to say; "as well might you hold forth an empty vessel to the parched and thirsty wanderer in the desert, as tell the sorrowing and heavy laden soul to be content with such a religion as this!" Is Christ the Saviour, "in whom all fullness dwells," this empty vessel! or shall we turn from Him who is the Well of Life, to the broken cisterns which men have made, which hold no water?

We might well meet Mr. M'Manus on the practical results of the two systems. He asks—"How rarely do they (in the Church of England) turn to religion for comfort and consolation, under the trials and calamities of life." We thank God we could show him multitudes who draw comfort and support in every trial from the Word and the ministry of reconciliation. But the religion of the heart is not paraded. All outward parade and show is but evidence of heartfelt want within.

But we must ever protest against religion being judged of by the conduct of those who are indifferent to religion; a class too sadly large in every Church and creed. The increasing multitude of Roman Catholics who never go to confession is an instance in point; a stronger instance still we noticed in our number for September last: It is a fact that of Irish Roman Catholics who go to America, not one-fourth continue Roman Catholics there. We gave the testimony of an Irish priest, from his own observation on the spot, that two millions have been lost in this way! What a commentary on Irish Romanism as the religion of the heart!

We shall consider in our next number which religion best meets the wants and wishes of our fallen nature. In the mean time we ask Mr. M'Manus to study the character of the man Christ Jesus, as given to us in the Bible, and consider whether that be not an object capable of moving and supplying every feeling of love of which his heart is capable; and whether it be not true that the more perfectly a religion relies on this best and greatest object, the more truly it becomes "the religion of the heart."

Correspondence.

ON THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Instead of sending a copy of my mislaid letter, I beg most respectfully to draw your attention to a synopsis of my arguments and objections compressed within the narrow compass of a sheet of letter paper. My sole object being the investigation of truth, and feeling an earnest desire (one, I think, which ought to be very generally participated in) of knowing the best that can be said on the opposite side, in this enlightened age, respecting the visibility of the Church, I also beg you will address yourself to the real difficulty, in a manner befitting the importance of the subject, without diverging into extraneous topics. I have particularly to request that you will not attempt to hide the real state of the question; truth loses nothing by being seen in its own native colours. If you have God's truth, why not support it powerfully? and if you are in error, why should you impose on your own soul if you would not be classed with those persons of whom our Saviour says, that they had closed their eyes, and that their ears were dull of hearing.—See Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

In the LAYMAN for January, 1853, page 10, column 2, you say you have no difficulty in showing the perpetuity and visibility of the Church; this, then, being an admitted principle between us, I call upon you to show where your Church existed in the days of Berengarius (circa A. D., 1040). 2ndly—I call upon you to say whether Berenger, or the various councils, churches, bishops, and ecclesiastics that condemned him, constituted the true Church of Christ? 3rdly—If Berenger were the true Church, where was the true Church before he began to broach his errors (A. D., 1016)? and also when he recanted and abjured his errors, and died a penitent Roman Catholic? 4thly—In the LAYMAN for September 1852, page 104, column 2, you say—"The Christian Church had never wholly revolted from God; God had never abandoned her; the fundamentals of Christianity—the means of salvation were preserved in her." You mean, of course, the Roman Church, and the other churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ—"Fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—See Canticles vi. 9. I call upon you to reconcile these expressions with her being "The Scarlet Lady," fallen into grievous and damnable errors, and drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus." 5thly—Berenger was bound to hear the Church, according to Mat. xviii. 17; to obey his prelates, according to Heb. xiii. 7, 17. Where were these prelates and that Church? 6thly—I call upon you to point out the congregation of faithful men among whom the pure Word of God was preached, and the sacraments duly administered, in the days of Berengarius,

according to the 12th Article of the Church of England.

These are the points I urged in my first letter, and I beg most respectfully to say, that in your answer you have evaded them by attacking the doctrine of Images, the Creed of Pope Pius, &c. It seems your correspondents must confine themselves to one topic, whilst you are at liberty to ramble; this plan, if not very honourable, is, at least, very convenient no doubt.

You say Mat. xviii. 17 refers to the offences of one man against another, which the Church was bound to reconcile (See No. for January, 1853, page 10, column 1). Much more, I argue, should she strive to reconcile those individuals to God, who may have offended him by errors in faith or doctrine, and, on the same principle, they were bound to hear; but your exposition of the passage is—"Hear the Church in petty disputes, and matters of minor importance; but if matters of faith or doctrine happen to be agitated, follow your own peculiar whims and fancies." I shall, at present, make no farther comment upon this very popular explanation, which aims at the subversion of all Church authority.

Respecting Heb. xiii. 7, 17, you cannot deny that the prelates here alluded to had the true faith, and that the people were bound to follow them. In like manner, in the time of Berengarius some prelates must have had the true faith, and he was bound to follow them; or there was no visible Church of Christ. I call upon you, again, to point out these prelates, as I have frustrated your attempts at explaining away the above passages of Scripture.

You argue thus:—"The doctrine for which Berengarius was condemned was not in such or such a Creed, *ergo*, it formed no portion of the faith of the Church; it was but the private opinion of particular doctors and individual bishops." I argue *contra*. Your Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not contained in the Nicene, the Athanasian, or the Apostles' Creed, hence, upon your own principles, you should have only one sacrament of the New Law, or else your arguments from the Creeds goes for nothing at all.

Lastly—I call upon you, most emphatically, as the onus lies upon you, to prove that the councils, churches, bishops, and ecclesiastics, that condemned Berengarius, were merely particular doctors and individual bishops, as you assert in the No. for January, 1853, of your periodical, page 10, column 2; and that the great majority of the visible Church supported the opinions of Berengarius.

I now proceed to anticipate some arguments which you may be expected to adduce; just merely to prevent you from wasting time at them, and to compel you to bring forward better, if you have any such in your theological armoury.

First Kings xix. 14, 18 is quoted to show, by analogy, that, as 7,000 faithful existed unknown to even Elijah the prophet: even so the Christian Church may be hidden in the days of Berengarius. I deny the analogy, for three reasons: first, Ahab, king of Israel, and Asa, king of Judah, were contemporaries (see 1 Kings xvi. 29); and, though Ahab persecuted and exterminated the prophets, still the Church flourished at the same time under good King Asa, in Judah (see 1 Kings xv. 11, 14), the Jewish Church then was not invisible. Secondly, Elijah must have known that Obadiah, the governor, had concealed the prophets by fifties in caves (1 Kings, xviii. 13). And lastly, and principally, we have the infallible Word of the living God, that 7,000 faithful existed at that time in Israel (see 1 Kings xix. 18). Now, as we have no such assurance respecting your Church in the days of Berengarius, I maintain that I have smashed for ever, this argument from analogy.

Next, Protestants have recourse to the expedient of a church within a church, saying that the true believers were mixed up with those of the Romish communion, like the tares and the wheat (see Mat. xiii. 24, 30); but it cannot be alleged that either the wheat or the tares were invisible, so here again the analogy ceases, and this theory is liable to all my former objections from the invisibility; and if Protestants cannot point out any distinct party, it is evident, their church if any previously existed, had become invisible and contradicted our first principle and postulate: "that the Church of Christ is perpetual and always visible."

Mat. xxiii. 2, 3, is quoted to prove that a church may be still the Church of Christ, though "fallen into grievous and damnable errors." Now the errors of the Scribes and Pharisees consisted in their pride, ambition, covetousness, and hypocrisy, against which the eight woes are denounced in the Gospel (see Mat. xiii. 13, 36, and Luke xi. 37, 52). Had they erred in doctrine our Saviour would not have commanded the people to hear them, as he did in the passage so infelicitously quoted by our adversaries; and though the Jewish rulers were, generally speaking, very wicked, there were bright exceptions: Zacharias and Elizabeth—see Luke i. 6, 67; Mary and Joseph—Mat. i. 19, 20; holy Simeon—Luke ii. 25, 26; the prophetess Anna—Luke ii. 36, 37—*cum multis aliis*, and not to speak of John the Baptist or of the light of the world, Jesus Christ; but who was there to protest against the pretended innovations of Rome, at the period I have selected, except that weathercock, Berengarius, who abjured and relapsed so often.

It is vain, Mr. Editor, to try to embarrass me with the creed of Pope Pius. I beg to remind you of the old adage:

"*Nihil agit qui sibi litem resolvit.*" You are bound not only to prove your own position but to answer the objections stated against it. If you show a disposition to do so by clear and logical deductions, and by Scripture references, as I am, in my humble sphere, a friend to free discussion, I will, from time to time, submit to you my rude arguments and objections, upon several other controverted points; but if you continue to evade, or to hide the real state of the question, as I said before, I shall feel myself at liberty to conclude that the defeat is in the cause and not in the advocate.

With unfeigned thanks for your attention to my communications, I beg to subscribe myself

Φιλαληθης.

The subject of the visibility of the Church is one which we willingly admit to be discussed in our pages. It is, however, an inconvenience that our correspondent should insist on discussing it upon a case (that of Berengarius) out of which no question arises about the visibility of the Church. It is rather hard to ask us to say which, Berengarius or his opponents, were the true Church, when they both professed to belong to the same Church. The Pope and Council drew up a recantation for Berengarius, and they began it thus—"I, Berengarius, an unworthy deacon of the Church of St. Mauritius of Andegave, &c.," in which it is clear that they looked on Berengarius as a deacon of the same Church as themselves. If Berengarius had been asked—"Which are you or your opponents the true Church?" he would, no doubt, have answered—"We are both members of the same Church, and the only question between us is, which states the doctrine of that Church most correctly." We really can give no other answer to the same question. We do not see how any question arises out of this, as to the visibility of the Church; though we do see a great question as to how far individuals are bound to believe and profess in the words which any bishop or any number of bishops choose to dictate to them.

The only way we can deal with our correspondent's letter is, first, to state plainly what we believe as to the visibility of the Church of Christ; and then to show whether Berengarius was bound, or not, to adopt the recantation dictated to him.

We believe, then, that the visibility of the church consists in a lawful succession of bishops, clergy, and people, professing the articles of the Christian faith, as contained in the Catholic creeds. We believe that in all ages, throughout the world, there has been such a succession of bishops, clergy, and people professing those creeds. The whole of these, as existing at any one time, we take to be "the visible Church of Christ on earth." We believe that Christ always has had, and always will have, such a Church.

So our correspondent has given himself a very needless trouble in finding arguments for us to prove that Christ might have no visible Church on earth.

We do not hold that every error held by individual bishops, or number of bishops, or even by particular churches (as the Churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, &c.), destroys the visibility of Christ's Church on earth; although such errors do deface the purity of those particular churches, and make them less worthy of Christ. The visible Church of Christ, as a whole, has never professed anything but the Catholic creeds.

Our correspondent has mistaken the meaning of the 19th Article of the Church of England and Ireland, which describes "the visible Church of Christ" as "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached," &c. This is the highest notion we can form of the visible church, one which should be ever in our minds. So far as particular churches come up to this, they have a good claim to be parts of the visible Church of Christ; so far as they come short of this, their claim is weakened and obscured. But this article does not mean that every departure in any degree, from that "pure Word of God," does wholly separate from the visible Church of God: and this is perfectly clear from the latter part of that same article itself, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of communion, but also in matters of faith;" so it is clear from the article itself, that a church may entertain some errors, even in matters of faith, and yet not wholly cease to be a visible church.

On these principles, we have no difficulty in answering our correspondent's question, "where the visible Church of Christ was in the days of Berengarius?" It was all over the world, wherever there were bishops, clergy, and people, professing the Catholic creed as their faith.

And even though the Church of Rome, and all churches then in communion with her, should have perished, or utterly fallen from the faith, Christ would still have had a visible church on earth; for there were then, as there are now, churches at Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and all over the east, churches not in communion with Rome, yet, perhaps, greater in extent and numbers, and some of them older than she. So little difficulty have we in answering this question.

And here we must protest against the construction which our correspondent puts upon the words he quotes from the LAYMAN of September, 1852, p. 104—"The Christian Church had never wholly revolted from God; God had never abandoned her; the fundamentals of Christianity—the means of salvation, were preserved in her." On this our correspondent observes, "you mean, of course,

the Roman Church, and the other churches in communion with her, which you here seemingly admit to be the true Church of Christ." We spoke plainly, and evidently of the whole church, and our correspondent says, "of course, you mean a part only!"

Now, this is really very unfair, and it is hard to argue on such terms. But we are quite sure our correspondent meant no unfairness. The fact is, Roman Catholics are so drilled into the habit of taking a part for the whole themselves, that they think every one else must do so too. But it really is time for them to look at this great fact, that the Greek and Eastern Churches are really existing, though not in communion with Rome, that they are, perhaps, equal to her in numbers, some of them superior in antiquity, and all of them superior to her in having preserved the Catholic creed without mixture or addition. It is time for them to learn that a part is not the whole.

We trust, we have clearly answered the question as to the visibility of the Church. We have nothing to add, except that we do not think that perseverance in error, when it has once crept in, is necessary to the succession or continuance of a church. On this ground we hold that the present Church of England and Ireland is the same church that existed in these countries before the Reformation; the succession of bishops, clergy, and people professing the same creed, having been then continued, and nothing done but the removal of errors which had crept in.

Now for the only question that really arises out of the case of Berengarius. Are individuals, clergy or laymen, bound to profess anything or everything that any bishop, or any number of bishops may choose to dictate to them? This is really the question that arises out of the case of Berengarius; it is a question of the infallibility, not of the visibility of the Church. To this we answer, that persons are not so bound to receive everything that bishops may propose to them. But, we do not, on the other hand, adopt the alternative offered to us by Philalethes, that every one is to follow "his own peculiar whims and fancies." A line must be drawn somewhere; this is the way we draw the line; all Christian people are bound to follow the prelates and clergy of the Church, in that faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church; but if prelates and clergy require people to believe other articles of faith besides what Christ and his Apostles delivered to the Church, then we are bound to refuse to adopt such things as our faith. Does Philalethes deny or adopt this rule? Does he believe everything that every pope or bishop, or council has said? If we do, we promise him a nice collection. If he do not, can he draw the line better than we have drawn it?

We said, and say again, that, Matthew xviii. 17, "to hear the Church," applies only to offences of one man against another; we say so, because our Saviour said so; for he expressly gives that direction to meet this case, and this only—"If thy brother shall offend against thee"—(v. 15, Douay Bible). But Philalethes says of it "much more *large*," should the Church govern men's faith; but his arguments are not Christ's words; and we must beg leave to take that passage simply as Christ spoke and applied it. The other passage he quotes—"Obey your prelates" (Hebrews xiii. 17.) is more to the purpose. We accept that passage as binding us to obey prelates, declaring to us the faith which Christ and his Apostles gave. The same Apostle who gave us that precept has told us also—"Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ"—1 Cor. xi. 1. But he has told us also—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, were to preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema"—Gal. i. 8. We do not understand St. Paul's precept—"Obey your prelates," as giving those prelates a higher power over our faith, than St. Paul claimed for himself; we, therefore, think that we are to follow prelates "as they follow Christ"—that is, in all things in which they follow him; but if any prelates should preach other doctrine to us, than Christ delivered to his Church, we are to count those prelates anathema.

But one clear case in which Philalethes himself must say that a pope and a council required a man to profess what no Catholic can or ought to believe, will, perhaps, have as much weight as many arguments. Such a case we have at hand; it is the case of Berengarius, which he brings up to us. We have before us the recantation which Pope Nicholas and his council compelled Berengarius to sign. That recantation was put into the canon law, and we quote it from the canon law, so there is no mistake—Decret. de consecrat. Dist. ii. c. 42. It runs thus:—"The true Body and Blood of Christ is said to be 'in a sensible manner' (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken, and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Now the only possible meaning that can be given to the word "sensualiter" is this: that the Body of Christ is handled, broken, and eaten, in a way that our senses can judge of and perceive; that it becomes the object of the senses; in other words, that the priest *knows by the feel*, and those who eat *know by the taste*, that it is the true Body of Christ! Yet, if Philalethes ask any Roman Catholic priest or bishop now whether this doctrine be true, that our senses can discern the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, he will be told that this is downright heresy, and not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; for that our senses can perceive nothing but the accidents of bread and wine; and cannot perceive the body and blood of Christ at all; and that it is heresy to say

that the body and blood are in the bread and wine "sensualiter," or in a way that our senses can perceive.

Yet this is the doctrine that Pope Nicholas and the Council compelled Berengarius to subscribe!

We are not the first to discover that the plain sense of this recantation is not only contrary to our senses, but is heretical according to the Church of Rome itself. We have said that this recantation stands in the Canon Law, into which Gratian put it. The authorised editions of that law have generally printed with them a commentary called "the gloss," and the gloss says of these words of the recantation—"Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incidis heresin quam ipse habuit;" that is, "unless you understand the words of Berengarius in a sound sense, you will fall into a greater heresy than his!" Admitting that the natural and obvious meaning of these words is heresy; and showing that these words must be twisted some way to get rid of the heresy. But there is no way of doing it; the words have one meaning only, and can have no other; that meaning is heresy in the Church of Rome itself!

The fact is, that Pope Nicholas and his council were mere bunglers; they did not rightly understand the Popish doctrine; and it was hard for them, for that doctrine was not settled until afterwards; and hence the difficulty that later authorities found in taking their words "in a sound sense."

Poor "Weathercock Berengarius, who abjured and relapsed so often!" They made him a weathercock indeed; it would have needed the true spirit of a martyr, of a Jerome or a Huss, a Ridley or a Latimer, to have come through that trial; and he had it not. Yet we feel great compassion for those whom the Church of Rome in her palmy days made "weathercocks"; for we know that in her mercy she gave them their choice, either to be "weathercocks" or martyrs.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to say, that you should first have shown, from unexceptionable authority, the Catholic Church of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or even of succeeding centuries, that my citations from Origen are heretical, and have been formally condemned; and when you give this proof you may then call upon me to prove, from orthodox writers of the first three centuries, the doctrine of purgatory. This proof I have, more than once before, called for, yet you have not attempted to give anything of more weight than your own opinion. Mere assertion is the only authority you oppose to these citations; and this, however respectable the party, falls far short of a definitive proof. The doctrine of purgatory remains untouched and unscathed; you have not yet disproved it: these are the real features of the case at present. Do not be tardy in bringing forth the requisite proofs, and the Catholics of the world will bless you for the enlightenment. You tell me to own that the Church, in the days of St. Epiphanius, had defined nothing on the subject of purgatory. I confess; and when you show the heterodoxy of my citations from Origen, I will prove that the Church long before that time taught the efficacy of prayers for the dead, and the remission of sins in the world to come. This you do not deny to be the belief in the time of Pope Gregory the Great. Let me now ask you, can a definition confer being or vitality? Or does nothing really exist but what has already been defined? Your charge, whereby you impute heresy to St. Augustine, is novel and startling. This is a light which the ancient Church had not, and which could not be found in any save in a very modern Church. This is truly a summary mode of disposing of an adversary, whose evidence is otherwise incontrovertible. You must also charge St. Epiphanius with *innovation*, or admit the distinction he makes between prayers for the saints and prayers for sinners: the former were decidedly and unmistakably *thanksgivings*, and the latter *propitiations*; and this fact, together with the *cultus* of the saints, is unequivocally set forth in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, from which you attempt to prove the contrary. First—"By the intercession of the most holy, immaculate, blessed above all, our glorious lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, by the virtue of the glorious and vivifying cross, and of all the saints, may Christ, our true God, have mercy on us."—*Goar*, page 63. This extract contains very important evidence in favour of the *cultus* of saints (but this apart), with a verification of the distinction recognised by St. Epiphanius.

Again—"It is truly meet to praise thee, Mother of God, who art always to be blest, to be venerated above the cherubim, and incomparably more glorious than the seraphim, who, in all purity, didst bring forth God, the Word; we magnify thee, who art truly the Mother of God. Perfect us, O God, by the prayers of St. John the prophet, precursor, and Baptist, of the saint whose memory we celebrate, and of all the saints; and be mindful of all who have slept before us in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life."—*Ibid*.

Here we see whether praying to saints was an improvement of an age later than the fifth century, or not; and we also find, that God was supplicated, through them, for mercy on the souls of those who were already departed.

These passages afford palpable evidence that the Apostles, the Virgin Mary, the saints, &c., were not prayed for indiscriminately with the other dead, and that the prayers

and offerings made for them were only those of thanksgiving; for it could not be consistent with reason that the Apostles, Blessed Virgin, &c., should be prayed for in common with the other dead, in one part of the Liturgy, and be prayed to, as intercessors, in another part of it. I am most anxious to have the question of purgatory dispassionately and amicably discussed, with Christian and charitable feelings, free from all levity, and from that acrimony which so generally marks the temper of polemical disputants.

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

We print the foregoing letter in courtesy to our correspondent, but we do not know that it requires any answer, since he has brought forward no new evidence or argument in support of purgatory. He tells us that we have not disproved it; but our business in this argument was not to disprove it—we were examining what evidence there was for it. We were content to waive for the present the argument that weighs most with Protestants, namely, the silence of Scripture about Purgatory; for Protestants cannot believe that if the Apostles knew that their converts had a prospect of undergoing torments after death, they would be justified, in common honesty, in concealing this from them, and in speaking as if their death was to be succeeded by an immediate entrance into happiness. But, omitting this point, we asked—Could the silence of Scripture be supplied by tradition, and can it be proved that purgatory was the doctrine of the primitive Church by the testimony of any orthodox writer for the first three hundred years? In answer to this question our correspondent has been able to produce nothing better than passages from Origen, which are branded as heretical by the Benedictine editors themselves, and which it is, therefore, not very unreasonable of us to decline to receive as orthodox sentiments. We pronounce, then, the doctrine of purgatory as still "Not Proven," and we think it is plain that if the Apostles and the early fathers had believed in it, it would have been easy to prove it from their writings.

We need not enter into a new subject—the worship of the saints—nor discuss the passages which Mr. Power has cited from the Liturgy which goes by the name of St Chrysostom, out which learned men are agreed did not, in its present shape, proceed from that Father. We quoted this liturgy merely in correction of the evasive expression that the saints "were named" in the prayers of the ancient Church, and to show that prayers were offered in plain words (explain it as you may) for them. Such prayer, we know to have been offered for the saints, from much earlier testimony. And it matters not that, in after times, prayers were offered through them and to them, unless it can be proved that these latter prayers were as ancient as the former. The fact, we believe, was, that in the times when men prayed for the saints they did not pray to them; and when they began to pray to them they left off praying for them.

ON A SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—It is evident that "Milner's End of Religious Controversy" has not put an end to controversy between the two contending Churches of Rome and of the Reformation. That astute theologian has charged the Church of England with inconsistency in having her ministers still called priests, while she has put away her altars, and pronounced the Sacrifice of the Mass to be a "Blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit." And this charge would indeed fall with a crushing force upon the Church of England, if by "Priests" they meant sacrificers for sins, and not presbyters.

But the question is, which of the antagonist Churches, of Rome or England, is right in this matter? The ministers of the former are held to be a sacerdotal college, or caste, ordained to offer for sins; there is no doubt of that. And it is as clear, that the reformers of the latter protested against the idea of such an offering, offered oftentimes (for which cause they suffered death at the stake), and retained the word "Priest," as it had been handed down to them from the earliest ages, as the proper name of a "Minister of the New Covenant," which is rendered, in the authorized version of the Bible, uniformly, by the word "Elder." The controversy between the two Churches may now be brought to an issue at once, by the discussion of this one simple question, which I write this article to propose—namely, are the ministers of the New Testament (or Covenant) priests (*ιερείς*) apart from the people, to offer for sins? or to offer Christ again and again, for the sins of the quick and the dead? or are they not? Does the eternal and unchangeable high priesthood of the Son of God, who, having finished the work upon earth, which his Father gave him to do, ascended upon high, carrying with him the blood of the eternal Covenant, admit of such an idea, or leave any place in the Church upon earth for a successional atoning priesthood? To whom can they be successional? Not to Aaron, for his priesthood is defunct; and while it lasted, it made nothing perfect. Not, again, to Melchisedec, or to Christ, as his antitype; for that priesthood is absolutely *αναπαύσας*; and since he "sat down" on the right hand of God, no priest coming after him, until he comes again, has, or can have, any authority from God, or from his word, to stand at an altar upon earth, daily ministering. The veil is rent, and under a new and spiritual dispensation every Christian is a priest—